UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,629	11/12/2003	Joseph D. Wong	10013526-1	7991
22879 7590 02/11/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			EXAMINER	
			REZA, MOHAMMAD W	
	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2136	•
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/11/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/706,629	WONG, JOSEPH D.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Mohammad W. Reza	2136	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 17 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_ filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below): (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) X will not be entered, or b) \( \square\) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 4-24. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. \times The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the enterprises corresponding in different locations in figure 1 in Williums's reference are not the different enterprises, rather than it is just one enterprise located in different locations. Applicant spent lots of writings to establish this argument. Examiner could not understand why it is difficult to understand that this figure actually showing different organizations or enterprises in different locations not just one single enterprise. Examiner bolt the cited part in the final action to clearly shows to the applicant that this figure consists of different enterprises. According to figure 1, the audit servers 12 are configured to provide DPF (Dynamic Packet Filter) and DPF provides a firewall between the enterprise LAN/WAN. Accordingly, It is very clear for the figure that all theses enterprises located in NYC, Chicago, and London has its own audit servers consists with DPF. So, it is not very difficult to understand that these enterprises are separated by locations because all of them have DPF and audit servers, not just one enterprise in different locations. According to the all independent claims, a second result comprising security standard applicable to the enterprise under audit and one or more other enterprises that together from a relevant group, and information derived from information previously obtained through application of the collecting and analyzing steps to two or more enterprises in the relevant per group. This limitation already shown in the previous actions.

NASSER MOAZZAMI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

215/08